

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his careful search and thorough review of the drawings, specification, and claims of the present application, and for his allowance of claims 5, 16 and 24. In the remarks that follow it is believed that all of the Examiner's concerns expressed in the Office Action mailed May 2, 2006, rejecting claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-23, and 25-27 have been addressed, but if the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner should feel free to contact the undersigned attorney.

This Amendment and Response to Final Office Action is being filed with a petition for a three-month extension of time, and the appropriate authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should any further fee be needed, please charge our Deposit Account No. 23-0920, and deem this paper to be the required petition.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has issued rejections on the basis that the recitation in the preamble that the account holder was responsible for the Internet access account was not worthy of patentable weight. *See 5/2/06 Office Action, at 10*. The Applicant has amended the claims to recite the limitation in the body of the claim. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections in view of the claim amendments above, and the remarks below.

Rejection In View Of Ronen.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 8, 12-14, 17, 19-22, and 27 as being anticipated by Ronen. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw his rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Applicant's remarks regarding the meaning of the term "account holder" in the prior amendment were addressed by the Examiner at the end of the Final Office Action in two parts. First, the Final Office Action stated: "[i]n response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., account holder as a person responsible of an Internet access account) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)." The claims, as amended, now recite "the Internet account holder being a person or entity responsible for an account for Internet access." The new claim language is supported on page 11.

The account holder **12** is a person or entity responsible for the Internet access account **14**, and can be responsible for payment, use, or the like. The account holder **12** can be the same as the user **18** of the account **14**. Alternatively, the account holder **12** can be a different person or entity. For example, a user **18** could also be one of the parent's children, but the parent would still be the account holder **12**. The user **18** can be an employee of a company, and the account holder **12** would be the company, exercising its prerogatives as an account holder **12** through supervisory employees of the company.

Second, the Final Office Action stated that: "Romen teaches a session manager that translates a connection ID used to identify the user connection into a corresponding IP address which in turn is translated into a user's ID from which the user's account can be accessed (**see column 2, lines 45-67**). Therefore Romen meets the scope of the claimed limitation. The cited portion of the patent reads:

The Billing Platform, in turn, using the Connection ID associated with the particular connection over which the request for service, information, etc. is being made, queries the Session Manager. The Session Manager thereupon translates that Connection ID to a corresponding IP address which, in turn, is translated into a user's ID from which *the user's account is accessed at the Billing Platform*. Once that user's account is accessed, authorization to proceed with the transaction is transmitted to the merchant ISP, which then completes the transaction with the requesting user. At the conclusion of the transaction, the billing information is provided from the merchant ISP back to the Billing Platform, *which bills the user's account in accordance with a predetermined billing mechanism previously established by the user* and determined by the Billing Platform in accordance with one or more parameters associated with the transaction. These parameters can include the amount of the transaction, the type of transaction, and/or the identity of the merchant ISP. Accordingly, the user's bank credit card, the user's debit card, the user's telephone account, the user's merchant credit card associated with the merchant ISP, or any other preselected billing mechanism is used to bill the user for the cost of the transaction.

Ronen, at column 2, lines 45-67 (emphasis supplied).

The claims, as amended, now recite "the Internet account holder being a person or entity responsible for *an account for Internet access*." (emphasis supplied) The "accounts" disclosed in Ronen are accounts for handling the financial aspects of purchasing from merchants, not Internet access accounts. Accordingly, Ronen does not teach a system where the user is responsible for the Internet access account.

The same arguments as apply to dependent claims 2-5 and 13-15 as apply to their independent claims 1 and 12 respectively.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 6, 17, and 25 in view of the disclosure of Ronen. For the same reasons as the Internet access account holder is important to claims 1 and 12, it is important to claims 6, 17 and 25. The arguments applicable to claims 6, 17, and 25 also render dependent claims 7-11, 18-19, and 26-27 patentable as having all of the limitations of the independent claims.

The Examiner further rejected claim 20 in view of the disclosure of Ronen. As discussed above, Ronen does not disclose an Internet access account holder. Accordingly, claim 20 is not anticipated by Ronen, and dependent claims 21-23 are patentable as including all of the limitations of claim 20.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejection Over Ronen In View Of McClain et al.

The Examiner has rejected dependent claims 7, 10, 18, and 26 as being obvious over the disclosure of Ronen in view of McClain. Applicants' examination of the McClain reference does not address Ronen's deficiency of allowing a server to contact an unknown Internet access account holder.

The full paragraph referred to by the rejection reads:

Referring again to the main rule evaluation process 500 (FIG. 5), once the exception list is queried for a rating on the requested content, decision block 508 determines whether a rating was found. If a rating is found, then the process branches to decision block 510, determining whether the rating passes the allow rule. If the rating passes the allow rule, then the process branches to block 512 where the rule that decides the status of the requested content is set. The process then branches to block 514 in which the completion of any monitoring processes occurs. The generalized monitoring process is described further below. In summary, monitoring involves the vending of a page, but logging of the requested content in a file for further review by personnel. *A warning can also be given about the possible nature of the content.* Once the monitoring process is completed, the rule evaluation process branches to decision block 516. If the deciding rule is set, which in this case it has been in block 512, then the procedure branches directly to decision to block 518. At this time the process determines whether the deciding rule is an exception list rule. If it is an exception list rule, then the evaluation termination process is initiated in block 520. The evaluation termination process is described in detail in FIG. 9.

McClain, column 11, at lines 11-33(emphasis supplied). This paragraph is better understood with Figure 5B, which has the blocks labeled for the processes recited above.




FIG. 5B

Here, the completion of the monitoring process is block 514. The text does not make it clear what is going on at this point – the details are expressly set out to be below.

The description of the drawings sets forth that Figure 8 is the monitoring process for the evaluation process of Figure 5. Figure 8 is presented below.

(space intentionally blank)




FIG. 8

To the best of Applicant's knowledge, the following is the associated text.

Referring to decision block 564, if the rule is not a block rule and is not an allow rule, then the process branches to the monitor rule process block 574. The monitor rule process is described further in FIG. 8. The monitor rule process 800 initiates at start block 802. The process begins at decision block 804 in which it is determined whether the rating fails a monitor rule. In general, this means that the rating requires monitoring of use and access to particular content. Monitoring typically entails the vending of questionable or unrated content, along with the logging of content to a file for future review. *As an option, there can be included the transmission of a warning of questionable content to the user with a prompt to the user to either accept or refuse the transmitted content.*

These passages indicate that the user will be warned that the content is questionable. The user is not warned *that fulfilling the request for the resource will result in the sending of a notice* as required by claims 7, 18, 26 and 28.

Rejection Over Ronen In View Of Grassle.

The Examiner has rejected dependent claims 4, 11, 15, and 23 as being obvious over the disclosure of Ronen in view of Grassle. Grassle does not address Ronen's deficiency of allowing

a server to contact an unknown internet account owner. Grassle discloses a system by which a parent may set up an account for its child to communicate with him the parent is not setting up a server that does not know the account holder to communicate with the account holder. Accordingly, these dependent claims are patentable because of the account holder limitation.

Accordingly, these dependent claims are patentable because of the Internet access account holder limitation.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 2, 2006

By: /s/Erik B. Flom
Erik B. Flom, Esq.
Registration No. 41,021

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/655-1500
Facsimile: 312/655-1501